

**TOWN OF WESTFORD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**DATE:** February 22, 2005

**TIME:** 7:30 P.M.

**PLACE:** Westford Academy Choral Room

**PRESENT:** Andrea Peraner-Sweet, Peter Fletcher,  
Robert Shaffer, Fred Palmer

**ABSENT** Michael Green

**OTHERS**

**PRESENT:** Tim Greenhill-Town Planner, Audience Members

**OPEN FORUM**

**Forestry Management Plan** - Andrea Peraner Sweet outlined the letter of support from the Planning Board in regards to the Forestry Management Plan for the East Boston Camps.

**PUBLIC HEARING – WESTFORD SWIM AND TENNIS**

*Preliminary subdivision, Littleton Road, Continued public hearing*

Greenhill informed the Board that the applicant had requested a continuance to a meeting in March, as the revisions to the plans had not been formalized.

**Continued to March 28, 2005 at 8:30 p.m.**

**PUBLIC HEARING – 74 STONY BROOK ROAD (DEAN DRIVE)**

*Definitive Subdivision, continued public hearing*

Greenhill updated the Board on comments received from staff in regards to the revised plans. The Engineering departments concerns had been addressed. Doug

Deschenes, Attorney for the applicant indicated that, to his knowledge, all outstanding questions had been addressed.

Shaffer requested additional information in regards to the information on the retaining wall included in the packet. He was concerned with the stability and aesthetics of the proposed wall as similar structures had failed in other subdivisions. Jeff Hannaford, the Applicant, stated that the wall was intended to stop snow from snowplowing entering the adjacent wetlands and would not be serving to hold any earth structurally. Hannaford indicated that the height of the wall would be approximately 3 feet and each block weighs 1,400 to 2,500 pounds.

Greenhill requested clarification on the status or intended use of Parcel 1 as indicated on the plans. The Applicant indicated that the intent was to deed that across to the Westford Conservation Trust. Adjacent parcels are owned by this organization. Greenhill requested clarification that, due to the reduced width and requested waivers, no additional roadways or driveways will come off of Dean Drive. The Applicant indicated that no additional driveways or roadway extensions would be proposed off Dean Drive.

**It was moved by Shaffer, seconded by Palmer and voted 4-0 (Green absent) to close the public hearing.**

The Board reviewed the Issues for Consideration prepared by staff dated February 22, 2005. Peraner Sweet requested that Issue 29 c be removed as it was stated elsewhere.

**It was moved by Fletcher, seconded by Palmer and voted 4-0 (Green Absent) to grant the requested wavier to Norse Design Services from Section 218-13E (1) Curbing, 218-13A (1) Sidewalks, 218-13A (1) pavement width, and 218-13 A (1) sight distance of the Town of Westford Subdivision Rules and Regulations.**

**It was moved by Shaffer, seconded by Palmer and voted 4-0 (Green Absent) to approve the Definitive Subdivision Plan of Norse Design Services Inc for plans entitled "74 Stony Brook Road, A Single Family Subdivision in Westford MA" prepared by DK Engineering Associates Inc. dated June 17, 2004 revised through February 9, 2005 showing a 3-lot subdivision.**

## **PUBLIC HEARING - ELDERBERRY ESTATES**

*Definitive subdivision Amendment, Continued Public Hearing*

Greenhill outlined that the Applicant had requested that the public hearing be continued to a future date as they were in the process of selling the lots to an interested party. Further details of the timelines and schedules would be available at the future meeting.

## **PUBLIC HEARING - ABBOT MILL**

### ***Site Plan Review, Special Permit Applications, Opening Public Hearing***

The Board requested staff to contact Town counsel in regards to concerns that the permitting process may extend beyond the Town meeting and conflicts with lack of staff may arise.

Peraner Sweet read the public hearing notice. It was moved by Shaffer, seconded by Fletcher and voted 4-0 (Green Absent) to open the public hearing on the site plan review for the Abbot Mill Project. It was moved by Shaffer, seconded by Fletcher and voted 4-0 (Green Absent) to open the public hearing on the special permit applications for the Abbot Mill Project.

Peraner Sweet indicated that the Planning Board chair was present at this meeting and requested that the Applicant give permission to absent Board members to read the minutes or listen to the tapes to bring themselves up to speed on the project. Peraner Sweet requested staff discuss with Town Counsel.

The Applicant, Chris Yule of Yule Development LLC, outlined the list of people working on the project and the format of their presentation. Lee Cott from Bruner Cott Architects outlined some of the work on similar projects they had done throughout New England including Mass MOCA, the Lowell National Parks and the Watertown Arsenal Mill sites. Cott outlined their experience and approach to historic restoration and stated that they were looking forward to working on this project in Westford.

Yule introduced Shep Williams, Landscape Architect for the project and outlined some of the landscaping features of the site. Yule introduced Bill Abbot, Legal counsel for the project. Abbot outlined three (3) of the zoning concerns contained within staff memorandum namely Parking, setbacks and the need for a Courier Site Plan and presented possible solutions to these concerns. Greenhill requested that these solutions be presented in writing to the Board.

Palmer indicated that he was excited about the project but had some reservations in regards to the safety of the proposal. Palmer outlined his concerns to the Applicant. Palmer was concerned with fire protection of the site specifically the sprinklers to the building, water supply and fire engine accessibility. Pedestrian safety and how the residents would cross Pleasant Street and the traffic flow on Pleasant Street and the Ownership of the Dam were also of concern.

Shaffer echoed Palmer's excitement about this project. Shaffer was concerned about when and how the Storehouse Number #2 building would be moved, traffic and pedestrian and traffic flows from the site and winter maintenance of the site. Yule indicated that the framework of Storehouse Number 2 was to be moved. They had looked some options to move the structure as a whole or to remove and replace the structure in pieces.

Fletcher indicated that he would be looking to have the structure integrated into the rest of the Forge Village community and was interested in how the applicant would achieve that.

Peraner Sweet outlined her concerns with the project. She was concerned that there were not enough visitor parking spaces provided in the project, that the Wastewater treatment plans buffers and setback were not extensive enough and the capacity of the site to handle moving trucks and vans. Peraner Sweet also indicated that she was interested in the affordable units, where they were designated and they types of units proposed. Peraner Sweet also indicated that she would be requesting the applicant to increase the number of affordable units within the project.

Peraner Sweet asked for comments from the audience.

Beverly Johansen, 9 Story Street, stated that she was concerned about the request for additional affordable housing on the site. Johansen indicated that the Town meeting had had a chance to request additional affordable housing on the site but had chosen to fund the Stepinski and East Boston Camps projects instead. Johansen indicated that she believed it was unfair to request additional units form the Applicant in light of this. Shaffer corrected Johansen in that it was the Community Preservation Commission (CPC) and not the Town Meeting that had made the determination that the request would not go forward to Town Meeting. This determination was made based on the fact that at the time the Applicant had not provided enough details on the proposal. They had indicated at the time that the proposal would be revisited upon the receipt of the additional information.

Chris Romeo, Selectman, also reiterated Johansen's concerns that the Town should not be requesting additional affordable housing form this project in light of the CPC's past decisions. Peraner Sweet indicated that she would not use affordable housing as leverage on issuing permits for the project but that she would continue to encourage the developer to consider additional affordable housing units within the development.

The Board scheduled a site walk on the property to be held on March 12, 2005 at 9:00am. The meeting would start at the building indicated as the Power Station at 7 Pleasant Street.

**The meeting was continued to March 7, 2005 at 9:30pm**

### **PUBLIC HEARING - SUMMER VILLAGE (WYMANS BEACH)**

*Site Plan Review, Special Permit Applications, Continued Public Hearing*

The Board confirmed again with the developer that the EOEa meeting with t he developer would be help at 487 Groton Road at 3pm on February 23, 2005. Doug Deschenes, the Applicant's attorney, indicated to the Board that the Applicant had expanded the scope of the review to include the entire site. They are in the process of getting a new public water supply approved and that the

15 separate septic systems would be combined into the single treatment plant. The proposal includes 285 units, a recreation hall, restaurant and swimming pool. Architecturals of the proposed units will be provided to the board but they are expected to be between 600 and 700 square feet. The public day beach would be eliminated. The proposal would discourage the use of cars throughout the site and preferred transport would be via walking or golf cart. Each unit would have 2 off street parking spaces allocated. The applicant indicated that they have requested a joint meeting with the various own boards.

Paul Hajac, Hajac Associates was present to outline the traffic study performed for the site. Staff indicated that this had not been peer reviewed at this time and requested permission for the Board to have an escrow account established to perform this review. Hajac presented the traffic study for the site.

Staff requested that the Board vote to establish peer review escrow accounts for the project. It was moved by Fletcher, seconded by Shaffer to request the Applicant establish escrow accounts for both the Engineering and Traffic review for the project.

Peraner sweet asked for questions from the Audience. Doug Bell, 98 Dunstable Road, indicated he was concerned with protecting the lake. They currently had good communication with the developer. Bell was concerned that the use of the site be similar in size and scale as the existing use of the site. Bell requested that limits were put on boating on the lake, and that the aesthetics of the recreation and community center be compatible with existing uses. He was also concerned with additional lighting along the lakefront, the removal of vegetation and the overall density of the project. Bell also expressed concern that there was a significant portion of the project that has not been discussed as to development potential.

**The Meeting was continued to March 28, 2005 at 8:45 p.m.**

### **PUBLIC HEARING – 52 FLAGG ROAD (KATE ROSE WAY)**

*Definitive Subdivision, Continued Public Hearing*

Tony Ma, Applicants Engineer, outlined that at the previous meeting that the Engineering Department had concerns remaining. These had been addressed in the revised plans and the Engineering Department was satisfied. Ma also indicated that the Applicant had requested a shade tree hearing with the Highway Department and the Selectmen, which would be forthcoming. At he previous meeting neighbors had indicated they were going to present some historical data on farming on the project.

Ken Gosselin, Hildreth Street, outlined his concerns and presented the history of the site as recalled by Town resident George Fletcher. Gosselin requested information on the soil testing for the site. Ma indicated that if the Board of Health had requested them they would provide the soil tests. Shaffer indicated that the Planning Board was requesting the soil test data.

Paul Mahoney, Flagg Road, voiced his concerns with the MDM traffic review. He had reservations in regards to the MPH calculations and the methodology of the study. He was concerned that the peer review had arbitrarily relaxed their standards on the site distance requirements. He also had remaining concerns in regards to the amount of fill proposed on site. Ma indicated that they were proposing 1,000 cubic yards of fill for the site and another 1,000 cubic yards for each septic system totaling 3,000 cubic yards of fill.

**The hearing was continued to March 28, 2005 at 9:00pm**

## **PUBLIC HEARING – WESTFORD TECH PARK WEST II**

*Site Plan Review, Special Permit Applications, Continued Public Hearing*

The Applicant outlined the information in regards to the special permits for the site with the exception of the Major Commercial Project Special Permit. The applicant referred to materials previously submitted in regards to the application.

The Board requested that staff confirm with the Board of Health that they had no outstanding concerns in regards to the special permit requests.

Palmer asked the Applicant to ensure that measures are undertaken to encourage structured parking on the site. Peraner Sweet requested staff follow up with the Parks and Recreation Department in regards to the use of the fields. Kate Hollister, 25 Vine Brook Road, requested whether any alternatives to the Reception field have been investigated. Peter Lash, Bear Hill Terrace, stated that he was concerned with the security issues associated with the recreation area and was concerned that teenagers would gather in this secluded area.

**The meeting was continued to March 7, 2005 at 9:00PM**

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

### **PERFORMANCE BONDS**

**Kindercare** - Greenhill outlined the work done at the Kindercare site and the request for bond release. Greenhill outlined engineering's request that \$3,000 be withheld until as-built plans showing the details as requested in the Engineering Memo dated February 17, 2005 were met.

**It was moved by Fletcher seconded by Shaffer and voted 4-0 (Green absent) to reduce the cash bond for Kindercare site work from \$69,183.99 to \$66,183.99 leaving \$3,000 remaining.**

**It was moved by Fletcher, seconded by Palmer and voted 4-0 (Green absent) to reduce the surety bond for Kindercare site work from \$69,183.99 by \$69,183.99 leaving none remaining,**

**Hitchin' Post Greens** - Staff outlined the bond reduction request for the Hitchin' Post Greens II subdivision and the memo from Engineering dated February 17, 2005 outlining their concerns with the Bond Release. Specifically that the work performed could not be verified due to weather conditions.

**It was moved by Shaffer and seconded by Palmer and Voted 4-0 (Green Absent) not to release any of the bond reduction requests for the Hitchin Post Greens II subdivision based upon the recommendation for the Engineering Department.**

### **DIRECTORS REPORT**

**Master Plan Appointees** - Palmer provided an update on the progress of the master plan committee. There has been limited interest from the community. Palmer was aware of one person in addition to the three submitted for this meeting who has expressed interest. This would bring the total number of people in the committee up to 10. Shaffer suggested an additional notification in the Westford Eagle. Palmer urged the community to become involved.

It was moved by Shaffer and seconded by Palmer and voted 4-0 (Green Absent) to appoint Peter Ewing, Diane Weir and Rob Weir to the Master Plan Committee.

### **LETTERS**

**HPGII – Emergency Department Letter** - The Board directed Staff to request a revised letter from the Fire Department in regards to the emergency access. The Board requested that the letter refer to a date as to when the fire department inspected the site.

**Wymans Beach** - The Board questioned the location of the proposed EOEa meeting. The Developer clarified that it was to be held at his offices and not at the site. The board requested staff to attend the meeting if possible.

### **MINUTES**

**It was moved by Palmer, seconded by Shaffer and voted 3-0 (Green absent) to approve the minutes of January 18, 2005.**

**It was moved by Palmer, seconded by Shaffer and voted 3-0 (Green Absent) to approve the minutes of January 18, 2005 as amended.**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by Shaffer, seconded by Fletcher, and VOTED 4 IN FAVOR WITH 1 ABSENT (Green), to adjourn the meeting.